

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## A discursive analysis of the in situ construction of (Japanese) leadership and leader identity in a research interview. Implications for leadership research

### Journal Item

#### How to cite:

Clifton, Jonathan and Dai, Wenjin (2020). A discursive analysis of the in situ construction of (Japanese) leadership and leader identity in a research interview. Implications for leadership research. *Leadership*, 16(2) pp. 180–199.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2019 The Authors



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:  
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1177/1742715019856159>

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

**A discursive analysis of the in situ construction of (Japanese) leadership and leader identity in a research interview. Implications for leadership research.**

**Abstract**

Interviews are a, if not the key way, in which knowledge of leadership and leader identity is sought. Yet, the interviews as a site of the construction of this knowledge are often “black-boxed” and few scholars consider how the “what” of leadership and leader identity are constructed as in situ social practice. Taking a discursive approach to leadership, and using membership categorization analysis as a methodological tool, this paper considers the identity work that participants do when constructing (Japanese) leadership and leader identity in a research interview. Findings indicate that leader identity is fragmented and contradictory and that identity work is skewed to producing a morally acceptable leader identity that has little to do with revealing underlying truths of leadership as often assumed. On the basis of these findings, we call for the discursive turn in leadership research to go beyond considering leadership-in-action to also consider the way in which both *meanings* of leadership and leader identities are discursively constructed as in situ social practice, notably in research interviews. Second, we call for more careful consideration and analysis of research interview as a site for building knowledge of leadership and leader identities, which, close analysis reveals to be fluid, changeable, and even contradictory. Third, we argue that researchers should also analyze what the particular constructions of leadership and leader identities “do”. This aligns with calls for more critical approaches to leadership studies that challenge hegemonic views of leadership and seek to make visible the power dynamics of presenting leadership and leader identity in one way rather than another.

**Key words**

Discursive leadership, research interviews, membership categorization analysis (MCA), identity

# **A discursive analysis of the in situ construction of (Japanese) leadership and leader identity in a research interview. Implications for leadership research.**

## **Introduction**

Since Fairhurst's (2007) seminal work on discursive leadership, there has been an increasing trend in leadership research that considers leadership and leader identity to be discursive constructions rather than reflections of inner psychological states. A discursive approach to leadership can be particularly beneficial for critical leadership studies by providing fine-grained analysis to challenge hegemonic notions of leadership (e.g. Fairhurst and Connaughton, 2014; Schnurr and Schroeder, 2018). Although discursive leadership studies have shown great potential to improve our understanding of leadership, to date, these studies have concentrated on analyzing talk drawn from naturally-occurring workplace interaction, mainly business meetings (e.g. Svennevig, 2011). So far, little, if any, of this body of research has considered how leader identities and meanings of leadership are discursively constructed in research interviews which are one of the prime sites, if not *the* prime site, in which contemporary knowledge of leader identity and leadership is gleaned. Consequently, the construction of leader identity and leadership, as a mundane and locally situated interactional achievement within the interview process remains poorly understood. Rather than assuming that the interviewing process is a neutral conduit for the transmission of leadership knowledge, we argue that being more clearly aware of how meanings of leadership and leader identity are talked into being during a research interview affects the "what" of leadership research and so might contribute to leadership theory.

Various researchers, notably Alvesson and colleagues have produced a series of publications stretching back over 20 years that draw attention to the uncritical use of interviews in leadership research (e.g. Alvesson, 1996; Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003a; 2003b; Nyberg and Sveningsson, 2014; Alvesson, 2017; 2011). However, these criticisms appear to have made little headway in affecting the way in which interview-talk is considered in leadership research. Moreover, little or no research – even Alvesson et al.'s op cit. – provides fine-grained analysis of the interactive accomplishment of leader identity and meanings of leadership during research interviews. We argue that taking a discursive approach to the in situ construction of leader identity and meanings of leadership during a research interviews can offer a detailed analysis of "how" the "what" of leadership and leader identity are constructed. Further, we contend that

paying more attention to how our knowledge of leadership is constructed can provide a critical stance to challenge common assumptions about leadership.

More specifically, and building on work (op. cit.) that is skeptical of the uncritical use of interviews, we use transcripts of a naturally-occurring research interview with a Japanese CEO when he talks about leadership to explicate<sup>1</sup> how a fragmented and contradictory, yet morally acceptable, version of leadership and leader identity is talked into being during a research interview. To do this, we use membership categorization analysis (MCA) as a methodology to explicate the production of leadership knowledge as it is interactionally and collaboratively achieved by participants in and through research interview-talk. We address two research questions. First: how is leader identity talked into being during a research interview? Second: how does the in situ process of construction of the “just whatness” of leadership and leader identity affect the leader identity and “just whatness” of leadership that are constructed? In the discussions and conclusions, we address the implications of knowing more about the in situ construction of leader identity and leadership for research.

### **Literature review**

This paper takes a discursive approach to leadership which can be summed up as an approach that considers leadership to be a practical accomplishment and which aims to show how “leadership is brought off in some here-and-now moment of localized interaction” (Fairhurst, 2007: 15). Whilst such research has used various discursive methods such as membership categorization analysis (e.g. Fairhurst, 2007; Whittle et al., 2015; Iszatt-White, Whittle, Gadelshina and Mueller, 2018), conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, and sociolinguistics (see Schnurr, 2018: for an excellent overview), common to all these methods is the primacy of the analysis of transcripts of naturally-occurring talk. The advantage of taking a discursive approach to leadership is that by analyzing transcripts of naturally-occurring interaction, any claim about what leadership is, or is not, and how leader identity is, or is not, are rooted in actual practice. However, whilst these fine-grained linguistic analyses of the doing of leadership have contributed greatly to our understanding of how leadership is achieved as in situ social practice, to date they have not analyzed how meanings of leadership and leader identity are talked into being in other venues such as, for example, research interviews. Whilst recognizing that what interviewees say about leadership may be far removed from actual practice (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003b), we argue that a discursive lens to leadership research could profitably focus on how concepts of leader identity and leadership are achieved

in speech events other than naturally-occurring workplace interaction. After all, as Alvesson and Spicer (2011) suggest, leadership should not only be considered in terms of practice, but also in terms of how people make sense of the world. This therefore:

“involves understanding leadership in terms of how people doing leadership – both leaders and followers – attribute meaning and significance to a whole variety of actions and activities in the workplace. It involves thinking about how some activities are labelled ‘leadership’ while others are not.”

(Alvesson and Spicer, 2011: 4-5)

Thus, in order to understand how people “doing” leadership, and leadership researchers, construct versions of what is, and is not, leadership, this paper provides a fine-grained discursive analysis of how meaning is attributed to leadership and leader identity during a research interview. The “just whatness” of leadership and leader identity are inextricable interwoven. This is because those who are ascribed or claim the identity leader are also morally accountable for carrying out certain actions that are associated with this identity and which therefore constitute leadership (Clifton, 2018). The interview thus becomes a site for identity work in which individuals create a sense of self and provide temporary and shifting answers to the questions “who am I” and what do I stand for? (Sveningsson and Alvesson, 2003: 1164). Furthermore, a point that we return to later, it has been noted that people’s identity work is motivated by a desire for positive and moral meanings to be attached to them (Gecas, 1982).

Ibarra et al. (2014) indicate that there are three main distinct, but interrelated, approaches to investigating leader identity. First, there is a body of work inspired by identity theory in which leader identity is considered to be a role that people play which carries with it certain socially defined expectations (Gecas, 1982). Second, there are researchers who draw on social identity theory and who investigate the way in which leaders embody the prototypical characteristics of the group they represent (Van Knippenberg and Hogg, 2003). Third, Ibarra et al. (2014) identify a social constructionist trend within leadership research which focuses on the relational and social processes through which individuals claim and grant leader and follower identities (DeRue and Ashford, 2010).

In this paper, whilst recognizing differences between social constructionism and MCA, we take a process and discursive approach to the construction of leader identity and the actions (i.e., leadership) that are associated with it. From this perspective leader identity, as with any other

identity, is mainly constructed in talk (Ibarra and Barbulescu, 2010; Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998). In other words, for a person to have a leader identity – whether that person is speaking, being spoken to, or being spoken about – is to be ascribed or claim an identity “leader” and the locally occasioned features that “go with” the identity leader (Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998). Thus we consider that the identity leader may be an empty signifier to which various contextually bound “meanings” can be attached (e.g. Alvesson and Spicer, 2012; Fairhurst, 2007). In the same vein, national identities and cultures are considered to be discursive constructs that are also “talked” into being (e.g. Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart, 2009; Hall, 1995). Moreover, considering linguistic relativity and the socially constitutive nature of language, a linguistically-focused analysis of leadership, such as ours, has been suggested as a way of capturing the subtleties of leadership in non-Anglophone settings (Case, Connell and Jones, 2017). This perspective is critical of cross-cultural studies of leadership such as the GLOBE project (House et al., 2004) which considers national culture to be a relatively fixed entity which drives one's leadership style (Jepson, 2009; 2010). Therefore, we do not assume a so-called “Japanese” leadership style with pre-discursive meanings. Rather, this study demonstrates the importance of a discursive approach to leadership by looking into how the meanings of “Japanese” leadership and leader identity are construed through talk.

Prior work has, of course, addressed the discursive construction of leader identity. For example: Clifton (2018) investigates how leader identity is constructed in and through stories told during a celebrity leader's talk to MBA students; Svennevig (2011) considers how leader identity is constructed in business meetings; and Baxter (2010) looks at how gendered identities of leaders are constructed in talk. However, research that considers leader identity as a discursive construction has not investigated the research interview as a site of the construction of leader identity. Rather, interviews with those designated “leaders” have tended to treat the interviewee as a repository of knowledge about leadership which fails to take adequate account of the context of the production of leader identity as a situated dialogic achievement. For example, a search of the ISI Web of Science for articles since 2010 with “leadership” in the title and “interview” and “qualitative” in the topic, revealed 98 articles in “management” and “business” fields, but only two of these articles (Burns and Stevenson, 2013; Sorrentino and Augoustinos, 2016) used transcripts of interviews in which the interviewer's talk was not erased. More commonly, the interviewees' words are re-contextualized and serve as examples to illustrate aggregates of findings which have been derived through coding processes (e.g. Yang, 2011) or are offered anecdotally to support other data (e.g. Holmberg and Akerblom, 2013). In extreme

cases, no interview-talk is offered at all (e.g. Schilling, 2009) and the in situ production of the data is entirely ignored. Thus, in leadership research, it is extremely rare that the interview as an interactional event is considered and that researchers engage with the local, occasioned, and in situ construction of the “just whatness” of leadership and leader identity.

Further, the interviewees are often pre-selected on account of their hierarchical position in an organization, and so a priori labels and hidden assumptions concerning who is, and is not, a leader are already in action even before an interview begins. For example: Meister et al. (2017: 675) based their research on in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted with 21 “women leaders” who were described as “senior executives” and Lumby (2009: 431), in an educational context, remarks that she carried out research interviews with “senior, middle and first line leaders”. Ironically, pre-selecting leaders for interview on account of their hierarchical position goes against the growing influence of post-heroic trends which argue that leadership is distributed across an organization and so is potentially open to everybody, not just the hierarchical superior (for an overview on research on distributed leadership, see Bolden, 2011). Consequently, the a priori choice of interviewees as leaders limits the interviews to people who *the researcher considers* to be leaders and as Schaefer and Alvesson (2017) suggest, this a priori assumption that the interviewee is indeed a leader makes relevant “templates” that inform the interviewee’s answers and so skews the talk to acceptable discourses of leadership.

Furthermore, the interview itself is often treated as an asocial encounter for the transmission of knowledge in which questions are asked and honest answers, treated both as accurate windows on the pre-discursive “real” world of leadership and leaders that is out there somewhere and as windows on states of mind, opinions, and beliefs that are in there somewhere, are received. Interviewees are thus treated as “repositories of facts, reflections, opinions, and other traces of experience” (Holstein and Gubrium, 2004: 144) which can easily be elicited and transformed into “data” providing care is taken to remain neutral so that the interview process is not contaminated. For example, George et al. (2007: 130), considering the interviewees to be simple repositories of data, report that they analyzed 125 leaders and argued that “our interviewees discussed openly and honestly how they realized their potential and candidly shared their life stories, personal struggles, failures and triumphs”, yet just how the researchers knew that what was said was candid and honest is not discussed.

Considering these lacunae relating to the way in which leader identity and meanings of leadership are considered in research interviews, we take a discursive approach to leadership

and leader identity and seek to provide fine-grained discursive analyses of the interview-as-interactional event in which leader identity and meanings of leadership are co-constructed in the interaction. In order to do this, we use membership categorization analysis (henceforth MCA) as a methodological tool as discussed below.

### **The method: membership categorization analysis (MCA)**

Following its ethnomethodological roots, MCA seeks to reveal members' practical sociological reasoning as they make sense of their social world through categorizing people and defining the predicates (i.e., expectable characteristics of these people) and their relationships (obligations and duties) vis-a-vis each other. In short, as Fitzgerald et al. (2009: 47) succinctly put it: MCA analyzes "members' methodical practices in describing the world, and displaying their understanding of the world and of the commonsense routine workings of society". MCA grew out of Harvey Sacks' work on identity. In his seminal article on categorization, the so-called "The baby cried. The Mommy picked it up" paper (Sacks, 1986), Sacks asks the question, how is it that we understand that is the mother of the baby who picked it up? To answer this question, Sacks proposes that sense is made of the world in terms of membership categorization devices (MCDs) such as family, and within such MCDs certain categories are commonsensically made relevant. Consequently, for example, in an MCD "family", categories such as mother and baby become relevant and mothers have the category-bound moral obligation to pick up their crying infants. Further, Sacks (1972) argues that identities can exist in standard relational pairs (SRPs) such as teacher/student, policeman/criminal, mother/baby and so on. Each part of these pairs has a series of duties and obligations that tie them together so that, for example, a mother has the moral obligation to pick up her crying baby, and so we understand that it is *the* mother of *the* crying infant who picks it up.

Thus, returning to the focus of this paper, we explicate how an MCD Japanese leadership is made relevant to the interaction. The categories of leaders and followers are then locally occasioned as belonging to the device Japanese leadership and they are talked into being in terms of the rights and obligations that leaders have vis-a-vis their followers. So, whilst mothers have the moral obligation to pick up their crying infants, leader identity may, for example, be constructed as having the right to be obeyed. Failure to be obeyed becomes an issue that is morally accountable, just as a mother failing to pick up her crying baby would/could be morally sanctioned. Moreover, investigating the way in which leader identity is constructed in talk



through members' category work also allows the researcher to investigate leadership. This is because categories have category-generated actions (such as mothers picking up their crying child) attached to them and which are explicitly or implicitly formulated as conventionally accompanying the category of leader. Consequently, talking into being a leader identity also entails occasioning category-bound actions that constitute leadership. Thus, as Iszatt-White et al. (2018) argue, MCA as a research method can address both the way in which the individual (leader) and the way in which the activity associated with that individual (leadership) are constructed in talk. Moreover, as with a mother picking up her crying baby, describing, judging and/or making claims about the identities and activities of self or other are a moral issue (Stokoe, 2003: 322). As Janyusi puts it:

“in examining the ways in which persons are described and the ways in which such descriptions are used to accomplish various practical tasks – e.g. to deliver judgements, warrant further inferences, ascribe actions, project possible events, explain prior events, account for behavior, etc. – it becomes clear that categorization work is embedded in a *moral order*”.

(Janyusi, 1984: 2, italics in original)

As a result of this, interviewees will, as Van De Mierop, et al. (2007: 366) notes, construct a version of the self that they, the interviewer, and a wider overhearing audience recognize as appropriate or acceptable. Thus, as Ciulla (1995) points out, leader identity is shot through with morality – most would regard Martin Luther King as great leader, fewer Adolf Hitler. However, establishing a moral leader identity is not something that is measurable against some kind of gold standard that is out there somewhere, rather it is a localized context-bound activity that is available to the analyst through fine-grained analysis of interaction during, inter alia, a research interview as the participants negotiate the meanings of leadership.

Sacks died tragically in a car accident in 1975, and some researchers (e.g. Schegloff, 2007) argue that Sacks was already turning away from his interest in categorization because it made too much use of pre-existing categories and placed too little emphasis on the indexical and situated nature of categories-in-talk. However, despite the development of categorization after Sacks' death, arguably, it is still not a fully developed method; rather it is a “a collection of observations and an analytical mentality towards observing the ways and methods people orient [to], invoke and negotiate social category based knowledge when engaged in social action” (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2015: 6). Consequently, as Silverman (2012) suggests, at one end of

the continuum there is a strong form of MCA, as argued for by researchers such as Hester and Eglin (1997), and which emphasizes the inter-relatedness of sequence and category. And, at the other end of the continuum, there are researchers who are primarily interested in category rather than sequence and who use MCA as an empirically tractable method for studying members', rather than analysts' categories (Stokoe, 2012: 278).

Whether taking a strong or a weak form, researchers (e.g. Hester and Eglin, 1997; Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002; Jayyusi, 1984; Stokoe, 2012) developed Sacks' early work on categories to place a greater emphasis on the occasioned nature of categorization which "eschews the analytical location of categories within specific, stable culturally defined collections" (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002: 68). Consequently, MCA has evolved to provide a methodology that allows the researcher to make visible, and thus analyzable, the turn-by-turn construction of identities in talk. Moreover, considering interviews as speech events in which participants display their practical sociological reasoning, MCA has been advocated as a methodological tool with which to make visible the interactive and collaborative production of "sociological" knowledge through the way in which people are categorized in relation to each other in research interviews (e.g. Baker, 2004; Mazeland and Ten Have, 1996; Potter and Hepburn, 2012; Roulston, 2006; Silverman, 1994). Thus, as Baker (2004: 163) argues, interaction in research interviews can be understood "as the work of accounting by a member of a category for activities attached to that category". Through using MCA as a methodological tool, the analyst can make visible, and thus analyzable, both the interviewer's and the interviewee's category-work in which morally appropriate and acceptable (leader) identities are talked into being (McKinlay and Dunnett, 1998; Alvesson, 2003).

Whilst it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a full description of how to perform MCA (see, for example, Lepper, 2000; or Stokoe, 2012), suffice it to say that, considering its conversation analytic and ethnomethodological roots, the *sine qua non* of MCA is the analysis of transcripts of naturally-occurring talk. Transcription is the first stage of the analyses; this is because it obliges the researcher to pay close attention to the text through repeated listening. The researcher should then seek to locate the participants' category-work within the ongoing talk. This should be driven by a process of unmotivated looking whereby the researcher brackets his or her own research interests and presuppositions as to which categories may be relevant and concentrates on the categories that the participants make visible in the talk. These instances of category-work should then be analyzed for the action which they achieve – blaming, justifying, accusing, and so on. The validity of the analysis is derived from the fine-

grained analysis of the transcript which reveals the participants' understanding of the categories that they invoke. Consequently MCA as a method does not rely on the analysis of large amounts of data that are separated from their site of production and rearranged by the researcher through, for example, a process of coding to reveal descriptions from which central tendencies are then abstracted. Rather MCA, in an attempt not to obscure observation of exactly how participants orient to each other's category-work, relies, mainly, on fine-grained single case analysis.

### **The data**

The data comes from an interview between a field researcher (the second author) and the CEO of a Japanese multinational corporation in China (given the pseudonym, Mr. Dragon). At the time of the interview (2012), the field researcher was working full-time at the organization where she was also carrying out ethnographic research into organizational culture. The interview was part of this project, and in the data presented here the field researcher asks Mr. Dragon about Japanese leadership. Since the field researcher spoke no Japanese, a bi-lingual colleague (given the pseudonym Emi) was present during the interview and she interpreted between Chinese (the researcher's native language) and Japanese (Mr. Dragon's native language). In this sense, unlike most research interviews, the data presented here is the product of a triadic, rather than a dialogic, speech event. However, in line with an interactionist approach to interviews (Wadensjö, 1998), we consider the interview-talk to be interpreter-mediated interaction whereby Emi not only "simply translates" from Chinese to Japanese and vice versa, rather she is an active co-participant in the display of practical reasoning. Whilst we are aware that most research interviews do not have translators; this is not the key issue. The key issue is that in a research interview (with or without a translator) certain leader identities and meanings of leadership are constructed in the interaction. It is this localized construction of leader identity that is the focus of the analysis, not the fact that this construction is mediated to some extent by a translator.

### **Analyses**

#### **Extract one: obedience and Japanese leadership**

We first analyze the initial question which sets up the omni-relevance (i.e., a category that, is always potentially applicable and relevant) of the category Japanese leader and which locally binds certain features to the categories Japanese leader and Japanese follower. The question,

as will be seen, refers to a quote in a book written by the founder of the organization that Mr. Dragon works for.

### **Extract 1:**

\*\*\*\*\* **Insert extract one here** \*\*\*\*\*

In line 9, Emi begins to translate the question which the field researcher has asked into Japanese: “so Japan (.) Japan's (.) <um> (.) what do you think about Japan's leadership (.) um (.) the founder”. This makes relevant to the interaction the category device “Japanese leadership”. However, as the turn is in progress, Emi self-repairs and in line 17 she explains the source of the question, i.e. the fact the researcher has shown her the founder’s book in which “it is written that (.) <um> in regards to their superiors Japanese people really (.) do (.) obey them (.) which is a virtue (.)”. Significantly, this question sets up a SRP in which Japanese leaders, categorized as superiors (line 20) thus equating formal position in an organization with leader identity, have as the second part of the pair Japanese people who have the category-bound predicate of obeying them. Mr. Dragon, being both Japanese and a superior is thus also, potentially at least, ascribed the predicate of “really being obeyed”. Moreover, this leadership configuration is assessed as being a virtue (line 22) which makes relevant a Japanese leadership style in which leaders are in a relationship with dutiful followers. In lines 24-31 there is again some negotiation of the question between Emi and the field researcher who speak to each other in Chinese – this has not been analyzed for reasons of space. Then, in line 32, Emi, rather than the researcher pursues the topic and asks the question again: “this (.) this (.) what are your thoughts on that point of view (.) what do you think about it”. This question makes a response a conditionally relevant next action which is discussed below.

### **Extract two: is obedience virtue?**

\*\*\*\*\* **Insert extract two here** \*\*\*\*\*

Rather than replying to the question, Mr. Dragon orients to it as being in need of repair and asks for more precision (lines 34 and 35: <the question is> (.) uh (.) that point of view is what point of view exactly). In response to this Emi, taking the initiative, adds a further increment to the question: “<um> absolute obedience in regards to superiors is a virtue (.) the founder said”. Emi’s turn therefore (re)elicits Mr. Dragon’s opinion regarding the founder’s assessment that absolute obedience to superiors is a virtue. However, after the question, there is a two second pause. Orienting to the pause as a harbinger of disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984), Emi

takes a turn which carries out the action of reaffirming the founder's words (line 39: he did). Mr. Dragon then takes a turn which challenges the source of this citation (lines 40-41: the founder said that where). In sum, Mr. Dragon orients to the category-work concerning Japanese leaders as being in some way problematic. Moreover, since superiors have been made synonymous with leaders, Mr. Dragon as a "superior" is potentially also incumbent of the category Japanese leader and thus is potentially ascribed the predicate of demanding absolute obedience. The dispreferred nature of Mr. Dragon's turn (i.e., repairing the question, hesitating, questioning the source, and asking for the source to be confirmed) projects disagreement with the founder's assessment and indexes the problematic nature of such category-work.

In the next 18 lines, Emi and the field researcher confer in Chinese and look at the field researcher's notebook in which she has copied the quote from the founder's book. Then, in lines 59 ff., Emi translates what is in the notebook, thus animating the words of the Founder and the Founder's version of leadership, and Mr. Dragon provides a second assessment.

### **Extract three: downplaying obedience**

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract three here \*\*\*\*\*

In lines 59-62, Emi translates what is in the notebook: "absolute obedience in regards to superiors (2) occurs (3) and that sort of (.) virtue (.) exists". In his reply, Mr. Dragon downgrades the assessment significantly and shifts from "obeying" to "listening to everything and everything", and so he does disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984: 68). Emi aligns with this disagreement. First, she latches an increment which completes Mr. Dragon's turn-in-progress (line 67: =that's right), and by adding a negative tag question (line 67: isn't it) she projects agreement onto the next speaker (Mr. Dragon) (Heritage, 2012: 17). In the next turn, Mr. Dragon upgrades his assessment by adding that that Japanese people will listen to everything and anything their boss says "even things outside of work" (line 68). Emi aligns with this assessment in the following turn (line 69: that's true). Thus, she further co-constructs the shift from obeying to listening which displays an orientation to the founder's category-work and assessment of obedience as a virtue as somehow problematic. Mr. Dragon then further orients to the problematic nature of this category-work by setting up a contrastive pair which compares Japanese employees favorably to Western employees as discussed below.

## **Extract four**

### **4a. downplaying obedience by contrasting with Westerners**

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract 4a here \*\*\*\*\*

In lines 70 ff., Mr. Dragon sets up the category Western people (in contrast to Japanese people) and ascribes them the predicate of being “more likely to obey their superiors absolutely”. Thus, Mr. Dragon downgrades the assessment that Japanese employees obey their leaders/superiors absolutely by minimizing this category-bound predicate of Japanese employees in relation to the Western people and by making relevant a contrastive pair in which a problematic practice is cast in a favorable light through comparison with other practices – in this case Western practice (McKinlay and Dunnett, 1998: 40). In lines 73-77, Emi translates what has been said into Chinese, after which Mr. Dragon self-selects to take a turn as discussed below.

### **4b. downplaying obedience by invoking context**

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract 4b here\*\*\*\*\*

In lines 79 and 80, using epistemic downgrades (“I don’t know the context” and “I don’t know”), Mr. Dragon downgrades his answer. This, therefore, significantly downgrades his claims to know about Japanese leadership and to evaluate the founder’s assessment that absolute obedience in regards to superiors is a virtue. Taken together, the downgrade from obedience to listening, the pauses, the contrastive pair, and the epistemic downgrades do disagreement with the assessment in the founder’s book. Mr. Dragon, therefore, orients to the founder’s category-work as problematic and resists the category-work that is ascribed to Japanese leaders, and potentially himself as a Japanese superior/leader. In line 82, Emi asks the field researcher to fetch the book, which she does, and when she returns some discussion between the three participants about the book follows (not presented for reasons of space) and Mr. Dragon, who speaks some Chinese, looks at the book.

## **Extract five: downplaying obedience by making a historical comparison**

We pick up the analyses in line 101 when Emi again elicits Mr. Dragon’s thoughts on Japanese leadership.

### **5a.**

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract 5a here\*\*\*\*\*

After some more negotiation between Emi and the field researcher in Chinese (lines 104-109), Mr. Dragon provides a conditionally relevant response as discussed below.

*5b.*

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract 5b here \*\*\*\*\*

First, in lines 110 to 118, Mr. Dragon shifts time reference and frames his reply in terms of “the founder’s time” (line 110). Thus, he accounts for the founder’s words by re-entextualizing them in a historical context. Further, since a potential category relevant for himself is “Japanese leader”, he denies the category-bound feature of “being obeyed absolutely” for himself, since the category leader is linked to the “founder’s time”, not the present. He then cites the example of Mr. Soichiro at Honda whom he credits with doing “Japanese leadership” but which is significantly downgraded through the use of “so-called”. Mr. Soichiro is also attributed the predicate of having “a certain charisma to him” and charisma therefore becomes locally relevant as a category-bound feature of Japanese leader. However, after this utterance, there is a 5 second pause, suggesting some kind of interactional problem. In line 118, Mr. Dragon, orienting to the word “charisma” as a trouble source, repeats charisma twice and then adds that “it’s not a Japanese word”, suggesting “<um so> it might be from Latin”. In line 120, Emi also orienting to the word charisma as a trouble source, speaking in Chinese and therefore addressing the field researcher, says: “charisma (.) I have heard of it but can’t remember”. However, the field researcher makes no reply and Mr. Dragon self-selects to take the floor and closes the topic of the meaning of charisma (line 121: <so charisma> (.) oh well doesn't matter). As a result, this pursuit of the discussion of charisma as a predicate of Japanese leaders is dropped. The problematic translation of the word “charisma” therefore indicates that the translation of words, such as charisma, that are culturally relevant in Anglo-dominated leadership circles may in fact be inappropriate for discussing organizational and leadership phenomena in other contexts (Jepson, 2010; Case et al., 2017).

In the continuation of his turn (lines 122 ff.), Mr. Dragon states that: “<so um> (.) the only (.) <uh> (.) well <uh> so because he was the only leader that meant he was seriously like the sun”. Thus leaders in the past, exemplified by Soichiro, were like the sun. This metaphor is vague and is not repaired by Emi. So, as Potter (1996: 118) argues it can be used as rhetorical device to “provide just enough material to sustain some action without providing descriptive claims that can open it to undermining”. Further, using “nowadays” (line 125), he sets up a contrastive pair (past/present) in which leadership is now performed by the organization whereas in the

past it was, to gloss lines 125-129, one person deciding and controlling everything. In contrast to this, nowadays it is “the organization” which has control. Thus, the latter-day individualized autocratic role of the Japanese leader is eclipsed by that of the modern organization, and Mr. Dragon does category-work that distances himself from the category-bound feature of demanding absolute obedience which is associated with the past, not the present. After this, Mr. Dragon’s turn is translated into Chinese (not included here for reason of space). They then look at the founder’s book which the field researcher has brought and Emi translates the relevant passage from Chinese to Japanese, as discussed below.

## **Extract six**

### **6a. Restating the case that Japanese leaders demand obedience**

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract 6a here \*\*\*\*\*

To gloss this translation from the book, Japanese employees are ascribed the category-bound predicates of having no power to make decisions (line 150) and no rights to give orders (line 152). This is accounted for by explaining that “no one knows (.) it's difficult um (.) sorry so if each person gives <um> advice and directions how far (.) <um> how thoroughly can they be followed (.) so (.) we can't say”. Mr. Dragon then asks Emi to continue translating (lines 165 ff.). In the continuation of the translation, Japanese people are ascribed the predicate of owing absolute obedience to their boss (line 166) which is assessed as a virtue (line 168). In the continuation of the turn, Emi (still translating) adds two further predicates to the category Japanese employee: listening to the person in charge and letting themselves be bullied. The founder accounts for this by saying that if this does not happen the “management’s leadership and power will no longer be one hundred percent” (lines 175 ff.). Thus, a SRP management/Japanese people is set up in which the employees obey the leadership and have no power. Following the founder’s assessment of what leadership is, a second assessment becomes a conditionally relevant next action (Pomerantz, 1984), as discussed below.

### **6b. Denying obedience is an issue**

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract 6b here \*\*\*\*\*

Rather than providing a second assessment, Mr. Dragon displays that he does not understand the founder’s words (line 179: I don’t really get it), and he accounts for this by suggesting that the translation is wrong. In the following turn, Emi aligns with this (lines 181 and 182) and



then Mr. Dragon argues that “Mr. ((founder’s name)) wouldn’t say something like that”. Emi aligns with this in the following turn by repeating the assessment (line 185: he wouldn’t). Collectively, therefore, they orient to the founder’s category-work as being problematic and they account for the founder’s assertion that the employees’ absolute obedience to their superiors/leaders is a virtue by arguing that “something is wrong” with the translation. In lines 188-202, not analyzed here for reasons of space, Emi translates the answer for field researcher, who formulates her understanding of Mr. Dragon’s answer to the original question which Emi translates as discussed below.

### **Extract seven: A volte-face, accepting that Japanese leadership demands obedience**

\*\*\*\*\* insert extract seven here \*\*\*\*\*

In lines 203 ff., Emi formulates the researcher’s candidate understanding of Mr. Dragon’s view on leadership and asks Mr. Dragon if his view of Japanese leadership is that: “subordinates don’t necessarily have to absolutely obey the words of their boss as you see it then”. There is then a two second pause which is a harbinger of a dispreferred response (Pomerantz, 1984: 70) after which Emi pursues a response by reformulating what is said in the book: “the book interprets it like that (.) the book says it goes top-down (.) yes (.) absolutely”. Emi thus does disagreement with Mr. Dragon by pursuing category-work that potentially talks Japanese leaders, and thus Mr. Dragon, into being as authoritarian as described in the founder’s book whereas Mr. Dragon has just done category work that counters the book. In response to this, Mr. Dragon projects a dispreferred turn which is indexed by weak agreement, pauses, and hesitation (line 209: okay so (.) um about that↑(.)). He then takes a turn which aligns with the founder’s assessment and which dissolves the contrastive pair Western/Japanese people by claiming that it is “standard” and thus that Western employees and Japanese both have the predicates of obeying their boss. Significantly, this category-work and alignment with the founder’s assessment is in direct contrast to his previous identity work in which he argued that Japanese leaders do not require absolute obedience and that Western employees are more likely to obey their boss (cf. Extract 4a). This volte-face therefore indicates that opinions are discursively constructed in response to the turn-by-turn organization of talk and do not provide fixed and consistent windows into attitudes, values, and beliefs that are “in their somewhere” waiting to come out. As Potter and Wetherell (1988: 54-55) succinctly put it, variability in accounts is:

“A major theoretical headache for attitude theorists since one underlying consistent mental state is generally assumed for each topic or issue. From a discourse analytical perspective, in contrast, variation of this kind is completely understandable – indeed it is theoretically predictable.”

At this point Emi takes a turn which does argument and so actively challenges Mr. Dragon's category-work. As Hutchby (2013) points out, argument occurs when an action taken in one turn (in this case arguing that absolute obedience is “standard”) is opposed in the next turn. In line 212, Emi takes a turn which makes relevant the category “West” where students are taught to have the predicate of “challenging even their superiors” (line 213). Emi's category-work sets up a contrastive pair (West/Japan) and does argument because by attributing the predicate of challenging the superior in the West, it challenges Mr. Dragon's category-work that obedience is “standard” and not just Japanese. Consequently, two versions of Japanese leadership are juxtaposed in an argumentative environment. Mr. Dragon responds to this challenging move by arguing that “challenging is different from disobeying the boss right↑” (line 216). He, thus, maintains his category-work in which the difference between Japan and the West is dissolved and in which Japanese and Western employees both have the predicate of owing absolute obedience to their superior and which, considering the omni-present category of leader made relevant in the initial question, conflates leader identity with hierarchy. Emi continues doing disagreement, and therefore argument, since her turn is prefaced by weak agreement (line 218: “no, um I suppose”) followed by a contrastive “but” which prefates an incomplete turn (line 219: “but voicing a dissenting opinion”). The turn is incomplete because Dragon latches on a turn, so taking the floor and furthering the argument by stating: “but voicing a dissenting opinion does not necessarily mean (.) not obeying your boss right↑”. This is then followed by an extended turn in which Mr. Dragon tells a hypothetical story to illustrate his point. Considering the length of this story, lines 222 to 287, it is not analyzed for reason of space. After the story, the field researcher moves to next question and the topic of Japanese leadership is closed.

## Discussion

Returning to our first research question: how is leader identity talked into being during a research interview? As McKinlay and Dunnett (1998: 35) point out, “the social characterizations which underpin ascriptions of social identity are always open to reformulation by participants in these cases where the characterization leads to apparent identity problems”.

In the case of this interview, Mr. Dragon orients to the problematic nature of Emi/the researcher's question about Japanese leadership and the fact that in the founder's book it is written that absolute obedience to Japanese leaders/superiors is a virtue. Since one identity available to Mr. Dragon is that of a superior/leader, he has a stake in which category-bound predicates are ascribed to this identity. Thus, orienting to the category-work in the question as being problematic (e.g., repairing the question, downgrading answers, providing weak agreement, hesitating, and pausing) since it might cast leaders and leadership in a bad light, Mr. Dragon does category-work which resists this "problematic identity", and he talks into being a morally acceptable leader identity for himself (and the founder).

Further, following McKinlay and Dunnett (1998: 35), the interviewee's turns at talk can be rhetorically designed so as to talk into being a morally acceptable self, especially if the projected category is perceived as negative. So, in this case, Mr. Dragon's category-work can be considered in terms of the situated local response to the ascription of a "bad" identity. To deal with the problematic nature of this category-work and to talk into being a morally acceptable category for himself (and the founder), he uses several rhetorical techniques. First, Mr. Dragon challenges the source of the citation and asks to see the book for himself (Extract 2). Further, he blames poor translation for misrepresenting the views of the founder who, he claims, would not have made such statements (Extract 6b). Second, on occasions (Extracts 4b, 5b, and 6b), he mitigates his knowledge of the book, and through displaying lack of knowledge he significantly downgrades his claim to epistemic authority in this domain. Third (Extract 3), he downgrades the assessment that Japanese leaders are owed complete obedience to the fact that employees will listen to everything and anything their boss says. Fourth (Extract 5), Mr. Dragon changes the time frame to account for the founder's views, and within this shift he argues that the individual leader has been eclipsed by the agency of the organization. Fifth, in Extract 4, he sets up a contrastive pair so that the West is seen as more autocratic than Japan. Though in response to the local situation (i.e., Emi's alternative and argumentative category-work, line 212), he later dissolves this contrastive pair (Extract 7) and claims that absolute obedience is "standard". Significantly, he thus displays contradictory versions of Japanese leadership even within the same interview. Finally, Extract 5, he uses a metaphor which compares Japanese leaders to the sun and which is difficult to dispute since the metaphoric meaning is vague.

The second research question we address is: how does the in situ process of constructing the just whatness of leadership and leader identity affect the leader identity and the "just whatness"

of leadership that are constructed? We argue that, through deploying these rhetorical devices Mr. Dragon does category-work that sets up a dichotomy between Japan and the West, which makes relevant a specifically Japanese form of leadership and which talks himself into being as not demanding complete obedience. Therefore, he constructs a morally acceptable and good self (i.e., incumbency of the category “Japanese” leader to which the morally acceptable predicate not-being-authoritative is attached). This, we argue, might also explain why leaders and leadership are often presented in a positive manner through “moral storytelling” in research interviews (Alvesson, 2003) – if the interviewees are talking as leaders, they would be threatening their own self-image if they presented leadership in anything other than positive terms. Consequently, we argue, that leader identity and the category-bound features that “go with it” (i.e. leadership) that are solicited in research interviews may have much more to do with the locally occasioned moral category-work that the interviewee engages in as a way of constructing a morally acceptable identity, than providing insights into the “just whatness” of being a leader and doing leadership that is out there somewhere in some pre-discursive form and to which the interviewee has some kind of privileged access.

Thus, we argue that an analysis of the locally situated identity work that Mr. Dragon does to produce an acceptable identity casts serious doubts on the, often implicitly assumed, idea that the interviewee/leader is a neutral conduit for revealing facts, opinions and beliefs about leadership that are “in there somewhere”. Moreover, the interviewee changes his opinion, thus constructing a fluid and contradictory version of obedience as a characteristic of Japanese leadership. Thus, our claims are far from the leader/interviewee-as-vessel-of-answers notion, whereby it is sufficient for the researcher to ask an honest question in order to get an honest, reliable, and accurate description of a pre-discursive phenomenon. Rather, we argue that when one takes into account the “how” of the construction of leader identity through category-work performed as in situ social practice, one can see that the category “Japanese leader” and the predicates that are associated with it are co-constructed in response to the local situation.

This is further complicated by the two contrasting versions of Japanese leadership that are juxtaposed in an argumentative environment (Extract 7). Thus, for the researcher mining for data, the question of which version of leadership should be privileged is posed. However, considering that researcher/interviewer talk is mostly erased from interview-based research, the voice of Emi would probably also be erased so that the CEOs/interviewee’s voice is privileged over Emi’s who is “just” an employee in the company and a translator. Also, significant here is the fact that Mr. Dragon carries out a volte-face and changes his opinion.

This suggests that opinions are discursively constructed according to the local turn-by-turn development of talk (Potter and Wetherell, 1988) and that consequently the interviewees' beliefs concerning leadership are also local constructions that are fluid and even contradictory.

### **Conclusions: implications for leadership research**

Many researchers (e.g. Fairhurst and Connaughton, 2014; Schnurr and Schroeder, 2018) are already calling for more attention to be paid to the communicative practices that constitute leadership and leader identity. However, so far this has mainly been restricted to investigating the doing of leadership as a practical accomplishment and has *not* considered how meanings of leadership and leader identities are constructed in research interviews. From a methodological perspective, we suggest that discursive leadership research could profitably also consider the way in which meanings of leadership are constructed in, *inter alia*, research interviews as well as the practical achievement of leadership in workplace activities. If the actions that interview-talk performs, rather than the supposed truths that are transmitted, are taken more seriously, we argue that a more nuanced understanding of leader identity and leadership can be achieved. Overlooking the complex and fluid nature of leader identity and leadership gives models of leadership a veneer of clarity and naturalness which encourages taking interview-talk at face value and discourages the investigating of how meanings are constructed as responses to the turn-by-turn exigencies of the interview situation. Consequently, through ignoring the fine-grained details of how leader identity is discursively achieved in interview-talk, the aesthetics of well-ordered patterns and clear-cut models of leadership, present in much leadership research, are rarely challenged. Taking the *in situ* construction of the just whatness of leadership in research interviews seriously would reveal leader identities to be fluid, changeable and even contradictory rather than neatly categorized into psychological and behavioral categories that allow researchers to articulate decontextualized “grand theories” of leadership.

Using discursive leadership as a lens for analysis therefore brings to the fore not so much what leader identity and leadership are *per se*. Rather, it allows the researcher to make visible how leader identities and meanings of leadership constructed to “do” things. This, we argue, is perhaps a way forward for leadership research. In other words, it might be interesting for leadership scholars to consider how versions of leader identity and leadership are locally constructed in order to pull off particular actions, in this case talking into being a morally acceptable self in a research interview. Thus, leadership may be an empty signifier as some

researchers (e.g. Alvesson and Spicer, 2012; Fairhurst, 2007) argue, to which various contextually bound “meanings” can be attached. If this is indeed the case, researchers could profitably consider what these constructions do rather than the “truth” of leadership they purport to represent. Investigating what constructions of leadership and leader identity “do” would promote a critical edge to leadership with a potential to look beyond the moral identity of “good” leaders to the inherent power dynamics and hegemonic versions of leadership that moral issues in leadership inevitably invoke.

Furthermore, the construction of leadership and leader identities as in situ discursive practice is complicated by the observation that the use of Western concepts such as charisma (Extract 5b) are oriented to as problematic by the interviewee. Yet, the notion of charisma has been uncritically applied to cross-cultural studies of leadership, such as the GLOBE project (House et al., 2004). Also, rather than assuming Japanese leadership exists as a hegemonic concept or style, our findings show that notions of (Japanese) leadership are formed, altered and negotiated through identity work. This therefore opens future directions for studying how national identities and cultural representations, as discursive constructs (Wodak et al., 2009), are talked into being as in situ interactional accomplishments.

The findings of this paper also suggest that the leader identities are much more nuanced, “messy” and contradictory than often assumed. El-Sawad, Arnold, & Cohen (2004) argue that whilst this is something that is both a well-known and a common feature of interview based research, it is rarely treated seriously by researchers. Yet, if leader identity constructions and meanings of leadership can be contradictory when looked at through the lens of their discursive, local, and in situ production during a research interview, then overlooking this observation may not be conducive to advancing our knowledge of leadership. Thus, at a theoretical level, we argue that taking the contradictory and fluid nature of leader identity, as revealed in this analysis, seriously could destabilize entrenched understandings of leadership. This argument therefore aligns with calls for a more critical approach to leadership studies which problematizes the categories of, and power relations between, leader/follower and leadership/followership (Collinson, 2017).

Therefore, we close this paper by calling for further studies, using discursive approaches to leadership, to be carried out in other contexts in which the meanings attached to leadership are negotiated. Such contexts could be other research interviews, but we also believe that a fruitful line of inquiry would be to look at the in situ interactional construction of the meaning of

leadership in contexts such as: leadership training events; media interviews with “leaders”; talks, seminars and presentations on leadership; events in which “leaders” talk about leadership; the telling of stories about leadership; and so on. Further, whilst recognizing that the analyses presented in this paper remain a single-case exemplar of how taking a discursive approach to leadership might add to leadership, we also suggest that an avenue for further research could consider interviews with other (Japanese) “leaders” to investigate how specific, or widespread, the accounting practices present in this interview are. Through gaining more knowledge about how meanings of leadership are achieved as in situ social practice, we, as leadership scholars, would inevitably obtain greater insights into the “what” of leadership and the “who” of leaders.

### Note

1. *Explicate* is used here rather than *explain*. This is because *explaining* usually frames analysis as causal effect, whereas *explication* refers to analyzing by unfolding a phenomenon and understating it in more depth.

### References

- Alvesson M. (1996) Leadership studies: From procedure and abstraction to reflexivity and situation. *The Leadership Quarterly* 7: 455-485.
- Alvesson M. (2003) Beyond neopositivists, romantics, and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review* 28: 13-33.
- Alvesson M. (2011) *Interpreting Interviews*, London: SAGE.
- Alvesson M. (2017) Studying leadership: Taking meaning, relationality and ideology seriously. In: Storey J, Ulrich D, Hartley J, et al. (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Leadership*. New York: Routledge, 67-88.

- Alvesson M and Spicer A. (2011) Introduction. In: Alvesson M and Spicer A (eds) *Metaphors We Lead By. Understanding Leadership in the Real World*. London: Routledge, 1-8.
- Alvesson M and Spicer A. (2012) Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity. *Human Relations* 65: 367-390.
- Alvesson M and Sveningsson S. (2003a) The great disappearing act: difficulties in doing “leadership”. *The Leadership Quarterly* 14: 359-381.
- Alvesson M and Sveningsson S. (2003b) Managers doing leadership: The extra-ordinarization of the mundane. *Human Relations* 56: 1435-1459.
- Antaki C and Widdicombe S. (1998) Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In: Antaki C and Widdicombe S (eds) *Identities in talk*. London: SAGE, 1-14.
- Baker C. (2004) Membership categorization and interview accounts. In: Silverman D (ed) *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE, 162-176.
- Baxter J. (2010) *The language of female leadership*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bolden R. (2011) Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 13: 251-269.
- Burns M and Stevenson C. (2013) Deconstructing national leadership: Politicians’ accounts of electoral success and failure in the Irish Lisbon Treaty referenda. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 52: 122-139.
- Case P, Connell JG and Jones MJ. (2017) The language of leadership in Laos. *Leadership* 13: 173-193.
- Ciulla JB. (1995) Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 5: 5-28.
- Clifton J. (2018) The in situ construction of leader identity in a leader’s life story during an alumni talk to MBA students. *Leadership* 14: 622-643.
- Collinson D. (2017) Critical leadership studies: A response to Learmonth and Morrell. *Leadership* 13: 272-284.



- DeRue DS and Ashford SJ. (2010) Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 35: 627-647.
- El-Sawad A, Arnold J and Cohen L. (2004) 'Doublethink': The prevalence and function of contradiction in accounts of organizational life. *Human Relations* 57: 1179-1203.
- Fairhurst GT. (2007) *Discursive leadership: In conversation with leadership psychology*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Fairhurst GT and Connaughton S. (2014) Leadership: A Communicative Perspective. *Leadership* 10: 7-35.
- Fitzgerald R, Housley W and Butler CW. (2009) Omnirelevance and interactional context. *Australian Journal of Communication* 36: 45-64.
- Gecas V. (1982) The self-concept. *Annual Review of Sociology* 8: 1-33.
- George B, Sims P, McLean AN, et al. (2007) Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review* 85: 129-138.
- Hall S. (1995) The question of cultural identity. In: Hall S, Held D, Hubert D, et al. (eds) *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 595-634.
- Heritage J. (2012) Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45: 1-29.
- Hester S and Eglin P. (1997) Conclusions: membership categorization analysis and sociology. In: Hester S and Eglin P (eds) *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 153-163.
- Holmberg I and Akerblom S. (2013) "Primus Inter Pares": Leadership and Culture in Sweden. In: Chhokar JS, Brodbeck FC and House RJ (eds) *Culture and leadership across the*

- world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 33-74.
- Holstein JA and Gubrium JF. (2004) The active interview. In: Silverman D (ed) *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE, 140-161.
- House R, Hanges P, Javidan M, et al. (2004) *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Housley W and Fitzgerald R. (2002) The reconsidered model of membership categorization analysis. *Qualitative Research* 2: 59-83.
- Housley W and Fitzgerald R. (2015) Introduction to Membership Categorisation Analysis. In: Fitzgerald R and Housley W (eds) *Advances in membership categorisation analysis*. London: SAGE, 1-22.
- Hutchby I. (2013) *Confrontation talk: Arguments, asymmetries, and power on talk radio*, New York; London: Routledge.
- Ibarra H and Barbulescu R. (2010) Identity as narrative: Prevalence, effectiveness, and consequences of narrative identity work in macro work role transitions. *Academy of Management Review* 35: 135-154.
- Ibarra H, Wittman S, Petriglieri G, et al. (2014) Leadership and Identity: An Examination of Three Theories and New Research Directions. In: Day DV (ed) *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 285-301.
- Iszatt-White M, Whittle A, Gadelshina G, et al. (2018) The ‘Corbyn Phenomenon’: Media representations of authentic leadership and the discourse of ethics versus effectiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Jayyusi L. (1984) *Categorization and the Moral Order*, Boston: Routledge.
- Jepson D. (2009) Studying Leadership at Cross-Country Level: A Critical Analysis. *Leadership* 5: 61-80.

- Jepson D. (2010) The importance of national language as a level of discourse within individuals' theorising of leadership - A qualitative study of German and English employees. *Leadership* 6: 425-445.
- Lepper G. (2000) *Categories in text and talk: A practical introduction to categorization analysis*, London: SAGE.
- Lumby J. (2009) Leaders' orientations to diversity: two cases from education. *Leadership* 5: 423-446.
- Mazeland H and Ten Have P. (1996) Essential tensions in (semi-) open research interviews. In: Maso I and Wester F (eds) *The deliberate dialogue: Qualitative perspectives on the interview*. Brussels: VUB University Press, 87-113.
- McKinlay A and Dunnett A. (1998) How gun-owners accomplish being deadly average. In: Antaki C and Widdicombe S (eds) *Identities in talk*. London: SAGE, 34-51.
- Meister A, Sinclair A and Jehn KA. (2017) Identities under scrutiny: How women leaders navigate feeling misidentified at work. *The Leadership Quarterly* 28: 672-690.
- Nyberg D and Sveningsson S. (2014) Paradoxes of authentic leadership: Leader identity struggles. *Leadership* 10: 437-455.
- Pomerantz A. (1984) Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes. In: Atkinson JM and Heritage J (eds) *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-101.
- Potter J. (1996) *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*, London: SAGE.
- Potter J and Hepburn A. (2012) Eight challenges for interview researchers. In: Gubrium JF, Holstein JA, Marvasti AB, et al. (eds) *The SAGE handbook of interview Research: The complexity of the craft*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE, 555-570.

- Potter J and Wetherell M. (1988) Accomplishing attitudes: Fact and evaluation in racist discourse. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 8: 51-68.
- Roulston K. (2006) Close encounters of the ‘CA’kind: a review of literature analysing talk in research interviews. *Qualitative Research* 6: 515-534.
- Sacks H. (1972) An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In: Sudnow D (ed) *Studies in social interaction*. New York: Free Press, 31-74.
- Sacks H. (1986) On the analyzability of stories by children. In: Gumperz J and Humes D (eds) *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 325-345.
- Schaefer SM and Alvesson M. (2017) Epistemic Attitudes and Source Critique in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*.
- Schegloff EA. (2007) A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 462-482.
- Schilling J. (2009) From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership* 5: 102-128.
- Schnurr S. (2018) Leadership. In: Vine B (ed) *The Routledge Handbook of Language in the Workplace*. London: Routledge, 323-335.
- Schnurr S and Schroeder A. (2018) A critical reflection of current trends in discourse analytical research on leadership across disciplines. A call for a more engaging dialogue. *Leadership*.
- Silverman D. (1994) Describing sexual activities in HIV counselling: The cooperative management of the moral order. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 14: 427-453.

- Silverman D. (2012) Beyond armed camps: A response to Stokoe. *Discourse Studies* 14: 329-336.
- Sorrentino J and Augoustinos M. (2016) 'I don't view myself as a woman politician, I view myself as a politician who's a woman': The discursive management of gender identity in political leadership. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 55: 385-406.
- Stokoe E. (2012) Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies* 14: 277-303.
- Stokoe EH. (2003) Mothers, single women and sluts: Gender, morality and membership categorization in neighbour disputes. *Feminism & psychology* 13: 317-344.
- Sveningsson S and Alvesson M. (2003) Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations* 56: 1163-1193.
- Svennevig J. (2011) Leadership style in managers' feedback in meetings. In: Angouri J and Marra M (eds) *Constructing Identities at Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 17-39.
- Van De Mierop D, Bruyninckx K, Leysen K, et al. (2007) Implicit and explicit identity constructions in the life story of one of Hitler's elite soldiers. *Discourse Studies* 9: 365-385.
- Van Knippenberg D and Hogg MA. (2003) A social identity model of leadership effectiveness in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 25: 243-295.
- Wadensjö C. (1998) *Interpreting as interaction*, London: Routledge.
- Whittle A, Housley W, Gilchrist A, et al. (2015) Category predication work, discursive leadership and strategic sensemaking. *Human Relations* 68: 377-407.
- Wodak R, de Cillia R, Reisigl M, et al. (2009) *Discursive construction of national identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Yang S-y. (2011) Wisdom displayed through leadership: Exploring leadership-related wisdom. *The Leadership Quarterly* 22: 616-632.

### **Appendix A. Transcription symbols used**

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| (.)             | micro pause                                   |
| (5)             | pause in seconds                              |
| < word >        | word spoken more slowly than surrounding talk |
| ((description)) | description                                   |
| <u>word</u>     | word spoken with stress                       |
| ↑               | rising intonation                             |
| word=           | words latched to each other                   |

## Extracts

### Extract one

- 9 E: so Japan (.) Japan's (.) <um> (.) what do you あの日本(.)日本の(.)<えーと>(.)
- 10 think about Japan's leadership (.) um (.) the リーダーシップについてどういうふうに考えてるん
- 11 founder= ですかあの (.) 創健者の=
- 12 D: =ahem= =ごほん=
- 13 E: =wait a minute= =ちょっと待って=
- 14 D: =Japan's leadership ha= =日本のリーダーシップって=
- 15 E: =Japan's (.) yeah (.) sorry (.) I'm sorry for =日本の(.)うん(.)ごめんなさい(.)途中
- 16 starting in the middle (.) so (.) she has でもおしわけ(.)あの(.)彼女がですね
- 17 <um> shown me the founder's book <あの>創健者の本を見せたんですよ
- 18 D: yes right うんうん
- 19 E: in the founder's book it is written that (.) <um> 創健者の本の中で (.) <えーと>
- 20 in regards to their superiors Japanese people 日本人はですね上司に対して
- 21 really(.) ob (.) obey them (.) which is a すごく(.)ふく(.)服従する(.)美徳があると書
- 22 virtue (.) in relation to that how do you (.) いてあるんですねそれに関してどういうふうに(.)
- 23 understand it 理解しているか
- 24 ((Talk between Emi and the field researcher in  
- Chinese, not analyzed for reason of space))
- 31
- 32 E: this (.) this (.) what are your thoughts on that この(.)この(.)観点についてどういうふうに

33 point of view (.) what do you think about it えーと(.)お考えご考えですか

## Extract two

34 D: <the question is> (.) uh (.) that point of view is <質問は> (.) え (.) その観点

35 what point of view exactly ってどの観点

36 E: <um> absolute obedience in regards to superiors <あの一> 上司に対して絶対的に服従する

37 is a virtue (.) the founder said ことは美德だと (.) 創健者がおしゃってる

38 (2) (2)

39 E he did= ですよ=

40 D: =the founder said that =創健者が言ってんだ

41 where どこだよ

## Extract three

59 E: =absolute obedience in regards to superiors =上司に対して絶対的な服従

60 (2) (2)

61 E: occurs をする

62 (3) (3)

63 E: and that sort of (.) virtue (.) exists ような (.) 美德が (.) あるんです

64 D: <um> Japanese people when it comes to <あの一> 日本人は上司のいうことは

65 what their boss says um (.) they will listen あの (.) 何でも聞くっていう (.)



- 66 to everything and anything (.) that's= そういう＝
- 67 E: =that's right isn't it =あそうそうですね
- 68 D: even things outside of work 仕事以外のことでもとかさ
- 69 E: that's true そうです

## Extract four

### 4a.

- 70 D: <um in relation to work> so (.) Western people <あの一仕事に関して>あの (.) 上司に
- 71 are more likely to obey their superiors absolutely (.) 絶対服従とか欧米人のほうが (.)
- 72 <more likely> to obey you know↑ <よくあの>服従だよ↑

### 4b.

- 78 D: in relation to business (.) see here↑ ビジネスに関しては (.) なちょっとね↑
- 79 meaning is different okay↑ (.) I don't know the context 意味が違うとね↑ (.) 前後はわかんないけど
- 80 which book and which bit I don't know so そのどこのどの本でどのぶんでわかんないから
- 81 see I don't know the context so ちょっとね前後がわかんないから

## Extract five

### 5a.

- 101 E: what she wants to ask is (.) Japanese people (.) 聞きたいのは (.) 日本人 (.)

102 their leadership (.) how do you see it (.) のリーダーシップ(.)についてどうゆうふうに(.)

103 what are your thoughts かんがえてるんですね

**5b.**

110 D: =so the founder's (.) so in the founder's time =あの創業者の(.)あのね創業者のころ

111 in other words so Honda's (.) Mr. Soichiro Honda ↑ つまりあのホンダの(.)本田宗一郎さんとかね↑

112 in the founding period (.) that is to say <um> え創業期 (.) いわゆる<あの>

113 Mr. Soichiro Honda during the founding period (.) 創業期の本田宗一郎さんとか (.)

114 his so called (.) そう言った (.)

115 <um> Japanese leadership <あの>日本人のリーダーシップというのはこれは

116 he had a certain charisma to him↑ あのカリスマ性ね↑

117 (5) (5)

118 D: charisma charisma (.) it's not a Japanese word カリスマカリスマって(.)あの(.)日本語じゃなくて

119 <um so> it might be from Latin <えーとね> ラテン語からかもね

120 E: charisma (.) I've heard of it but can't remember カリスマ(.)我听到过但忘记了

121 D: <so charisma> (.) oh well doesn't matter <カリスマ性とねまー> (.) まあいいや

122 <so um> (.) the only (.) <uh> (.) well <そういったあの> (.) 唯一 (.) <えー> (.) まあ

123 <uh> so because he was the only leader that <あー>それこそ太陽みたいなリーダーシップ

124 meant he was seriously like the sun (.) but ということで非常に ありました (.) しかし

125 nowadays leadership is (.) an organization 現在のリーダーシップ というのは (.) あの組織

|     |   |                             |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 126 | <uh> according to one person one president or         | <えー>一人の一人のあの社長とか一人のトップ      |
| 127 | one boss(.) <um> that person decides everything       | によって (.) <あの>すべてを決めるとか      |
| 128 | <um> either <u>that person</u> decides everything     | <あの> <u>その人が</u> すべてを決めるのか  |
| 129 | or from <u>that person</u> controlling the whole      | <u>その人が</u> 全体を動かすということで組織で |
| 130 | it's become that the organization has the control (.) | 動かすことになってるから (.)            |
| 131 | <uh> the Japanese people                              | <えー>1960 年代                 |
| 132 | from the sixties and seventies and from today         | 70 年代と今の日本人の (.) <え>リーダー    |
| 133 | <so> their leadership is (.) it's clearly become      | シップというのは (.) 明らかに違ってるという    |
| 134 | something different or so I (.) understand it         | ふうにかわっていきてるふうには (.) 理解してる   |

## Extract six

### 6a.

|     |   |                          |
|-----|---|--------------------------|
| 147 | E: <um> (.) so the employees (.) are the ones that  | <あの> (.) あの従業員は (.) あの仕事 |
| 148 | do the work he seems to think he said (.)           | やるものだと考えていらし言ったんです (.)   |
| 149 | in Japan (.) <um> (.) <um> the                      | 日本では (.) <えーと> (.) <えーと> |
| 150 | employees have no power to make decisions           | 従業員はですね命令はない             |
| 151 | (5)   | (5)                      |
| 152 | <um> (.) they have no right to give orders          | <えーと> (.) 命令権はないです       |
| 153 | ((reading)) if each person wants to give advice and | ((読書)) 各人は忠告と指導          |
| 154 | directions <um> (.) if they all want that (.) <um>  | を<えーと> (.) 求めて (.) <えーと> |

|     |   |                             |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|
| 155 | (3)   | (3)                         |
| 156 | it's a problem (.) <um> (.) who to follow             | 困りですね (.) <えーと> (.) つまぬくか   |
| 157 | no one knows (.) it's difficult                       | 分からない (.) これは難しいですね         |
| 158 | um (.) sorry  | あの (.) ごめんなさい               |
| 159 | so if each person gives                               | あの各人の忠告と指導を                 |
| 160 | <um> advice and directions                            | <えーと> してもですね                |
| 161 | how far (.) <um> how thoroughly                       | どこまで (.) <えーと> 徹底           |
| 162 | can they be followed (.) so (.) we can't say          | できるかですね (.) その (.) まあ言えない   |
| 163 | (4)   | (4)                         |
| 164 | D: then after that                                    | でそのあと                       |
| 165 | E: how far (.) <um> right Japanese people             | どこまで (.) <えーと> そうですね日本人は    |
| 166 | in regards to their boss (.) their absolute obedience | 上司に対して (.) 絶対的に服従する         |
| 167 | <u>that sort of</u>                                   | <u>ような</u>                  |
| 168 | <u>something like that</u> (.) <um> it's a virtue     | <u>みたいな</u> (.) <えーと> 美德ですね |
| 169 | well it is (.) why that is <um>                       | まああるんです (.) あのなぜかというとかれらは   |
| 170 | <u>if</u> they don't listen to the person in charge   | <えーと> 責任者の話を聞かない <u>と</u>   |
| 171 | (2)   | (2)                         |
| 172 | and let themselves be bullied                         | いじめてくると                     |
| 173 | if that happens (.) <um> even if they have            | こうするとですね (.) <えーと> 責任もあっても  |

|     |  |               |
|-----|--|---------------|
| 174 | responsibility they have no power (.)          | 権勢がない (.)     |
| 175 | the management's leadership and power will (.) | 幹部の主導せ権勢は (.) |
| 176 | <um>   | <えーと>         |
| 177 | (2)  | (2)           |
| 178 | no longer be at 100%                           | 100%となくなります   |

**6b.**

|     |  |                               |
|-----|--|-------------------------------|
| 179 | D: I don't really get it (.) that (.) something is   | よくわかんない(.)それ(.)あのなんか          |
| 180 | wrong I think↑ (.) the translation                   | 間違ってゐるね↑(.)訳                  |
| 181 | E: the translation is (.) there were mistakes↑       | 翻訳が(.)間違いあったんですよ↑             |
| 182 | there are spelling mistakes                          | スペルが間違ってた                     |
| 183 | D: yeah that's probably it (.) Mr ((founder's name)) | 多分それ(.)それはね((founder))さんがそういう |
| 184 | <u>wouldn't say</u> something like that=             | ことは <u>言わない</u> し=            |
| 185 | E: = he wouldn't                                     | =言わないですね                      |
| 186 | D: something is <u>wrong</u> here                    | ちょっと <u>違う</u> ねこれは           |
| 187 | E: the translation is a bit wrong                    | 翻訳はちょっとそれなんか                  |
| 188 | D: that's (.) written wrongly                        | ちょっと間違ったの(.)書いてありますね          |

**Extract seven**

|     |   |                |
|-----|---|----------------|
| 203 | E: subordinates don't necessarily have to | 部下はですね上司の言うことを |
|-----|---|----------------|

|     |   |                                      |
|-----|---|--------------------------------------|
| 204 | absolutely obey the words of their boss                             | 絶対的に服従しないといけないという                    |
| 205 | as you see it then  | 考えはないですね                             |
| 206 | (2)   | (2)                                  |
| 207 | E: <u>the book</u> interprets it like that (.) the <u>book</u> says | <u>講書</u> でそうだったんですよ(.) <u>講書</u> では |
| 208 | it goes top-down (.) yes (.) absolutely                             | トップダウンって (.) うん (.) 絶対的って            |
| 209 | D: okay so (.) um about that ↑ (.) the idea that what your          | あのね (.) まーそれがね↑ (.) あの上司の言う          |
| 210 | boss tells you is absolute isn't just for                           | ことは絶対だというのはこれは日本人だけじゃなく              |
| 211 | Japanese people (.) anywhere (.) it's standard                      | て (.) どこでも (.) 基本的なそう                |
| 212 | E: at the moment in the West I think at business                    | いま欧米ではですねたぶんビジネススクールと                |
| 213 | schools they teach students to <um> challenge                       | かではやっぱり<あの>チャレンジ                     |
| 214 | even their superiors (.) <um like>                                  | 上司も (.) <まーなんか>                      |
| 215 | it seems like that's the case=                                      | あるみたいですね=                            |
| 216 | D: =yes but <u>challenging</u> is different from                    | =うんでも <u>チャレンジ</u> ということって別に         |
| 217 | disobeying the <u>boss</u> right↑                                   | <u>上司</u> 逆らうことじゃないでしょ↑              |
| 218 | E: <no um I suppose>  | <いやあのそうですね>                          |
| 219 | but <u>voicing a dissenting</u> opinion=                            | あの <u>反対意見をいう</u> =                  |
| 220 | D: =but <u>voicing a dissenting</u> opinion does not                | =いや <u>反対意見をいう</u> のは                |
| 221 | necessarily mean (.) not obeying your boss right↑                   | 別に (.) 上司に服従しないということないでしょ↑           |